

REMARKS

The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

The applicant affirms their election of claims 1-19 and 23-28 and species of the formula (21) of claim 28 with traverse. Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction requirement because the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish distinctness.

In particular, MPEP § 803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.


The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. It is respectfully submitted that it would be necessary to search in all Classes and subclasses identified at page 2 of the outstanding Official Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding Election requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

The applicant believes that at least Group II should be rejoined with Group I.


Claims 1-15, 17-19, 23, 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Büsing et al (WO 2004/037887, cited with equivalent US 2006058494) ("Büsing") in combination with Chen et al. (US 20030164499) ("Chen") as evidences by Yun et al. (US 5650456) ("Yun"). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Büsing is disclosed at pages 10 and 13 of the applicant's specification. The statement of the Examiner is correct that Büsing discloses a polymer comprising triarylamine units of formula (1).



Formula (1)

The applicant's claim formula (21) may be structural similarity between this unit of formula (1) and the unit of formula (21), however there are the following differences indicated below:



Formula (21)

Nevertheless, even if there is a structural similarity, both units differ significantly with respect to their properties. This can be seen from the fact that, even if both units are used in polymers as part of OLEDs, as stated by the Examiner, the unit of formula (1) is used as a “hole-transporting unit” whereas the unit of formula (21) of the present application is used as a “light emitting unit”.

Due to the differences pointed out above, it is not obvious for a person skilled in the art, to use the materials disclosed by Chen as well as Yun which are so-called “small molecules”, as units in the polymer of Büsing.

Furthermore, according to example 4 of the present application, an inventive polymer P1 is compared with a comparative polymer V1. The Examiner will note, that both polymers contain 10 mol% of a monomer unit M3 (i.e. triarylamine unit) which is similar to the unit of formula (1) as disclosed by Büsing. Both polymers only differ in that the inventive polymer P1 comprises 10 mol% of the inventive monomer “CUM1” whereas the comparative polymer V1 comprises 10 mol% of monomer unit “M4”. Both polymers differ significantly, as can be seen from example 7 of the present application together with figure 1. The inventive monomer units are therefore suitable for significantly increasing the photostability and thus the lifetime of blue

conjugated polymers. This result is not obvious with respect to the cited prior art, especially with respect to the fact that the comparative polymer comprises units as disclosed by Büsing.

For the above reasons, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

A one month extension fee has been paid. Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 14113-00011-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Ashley I. Pezzner/
Ashley I. Pezzner
Registration No.: 35,646
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P. O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-2207
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant